

Imp. Sci.
Govt.
1



3 1761 09702294 1

ELECTIONS DIRECTLY BY THE PEOPLE

[by
Thomas Darlington Ingram] (1843-)



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

<https://archive.org/details/electionsdirectl00ingr>

With Compliments of the Author.
Thos. D. Sugrue M.D.

[Paper No. 1]

HONEST ELECTIONS DIRECTLY BY THE PEOPLE

THE CORNER-STONE OF A TRUE REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT
MUST BE FOUND IN HONEST ELECTIONS CONDUCTED
DIRECTLY BY THE PEOPLE

A DIRECT APPEAL TO THE WHOLE PEOPLE TO JOIN IN ADOPTING
A SIMPLE METHOD OF DIRECT ELECTIONS, BY BALLOTS TO
BE CAST AT ONCE AT THEIR LOCAL POLLING
PLACES BY ALL THE VOTERS CON-
CERNED IN THE ELECTION

A METHOD OF CONDUCTING ELECTIONS DIRECTLY BY ALL THE
VOTERS CONCERNED, WHICH AT ONCE BLOTS OUT THE SUP-
POSED NECESSITY OF CONVENTIONS AND OF DELE-
GATING, OR OF HAVING ELECTIONS CON-
DUCTED AND CONTROLLED BY A
FEW MEN

AN IMMEDIATE AND EFFECTIVE REMEDY FOR ALL THE GREAT MASS
OF POLITICAL CORRUPTION WHICH HAS BEEN DEVELOPED
BY REASON OF THE INNUMERABLE OPPORTUNITIES
AFFORDED BY THE DELEGATE AND CON-
VENTION METHOD OF ELECTING
MEN TO OFFICE
BY

ONE OF THE PEOPLE

TO THE END

**“That Government of the People, By the People,
and For the People Shall not Perish
from the Earth”**

COPYRIGHT 1907

BY

THOMAS D. INGRAM, M. D.

PRESS OF
THE LAW REPORTER PRINTING CO.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Elections Must be Directly by the People

THE CORNER-STONE OF A TRUE REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT
MUST BE FOUND IN HONEST ELECTIONS, CONDUCTED DIRECTLY
BY THE PEOPLE.

Every elective office-holder in a truly free government must owe his election directly and truthfully to the will of a concurring majority of all the voters concerned in the election.

Any elective office-holder, no matter how great nor how small his position, who does not owe his election directly to the people will not be led to serve the people honestly and truthfully, but will very naturally serve the men to whom he more directly owes his selection. Or else, quite often indeed, he will serve most assiduously those men to whom he is looking forward for a re-election to office.

Any method of electing men to office which entrusts any part of their selection to a *few men*, acting as *delegates*, endangers the underlying principles of a free government. It leads the office-holder to feel that he owes his election to these *few men* who more directly selected him, rather than to the great mass of voters he is allowed to represent. It develops at once a corrupt trafficking between the office-seeker, and later the office-holder, and the men who seek to be delegates to nominating conventions.

So, also, the method of electing United States Senators, directly by the *few men* in each State comprising the State legislatures, who in reality act by delegated authority, furnishes a yet graver example where the greatest opportunities are afforded for corrupt trafficking in personal interests, between *these few men*, between men seeking or holding offices of great power in our National Government and men holding similarly high offices in our State governments, and including the *men*

who seek to serve as delegates to local or general party nominating conventions.

These charges are made against the system of delegating and of conventions, and are intended to be neither partisan nor personal, they are aimed at an illogical, deceptive, unnecessary and evil-breeding system, which has grown veritably dangerous from the opportunities it constantly affords for corrupting our elections.

No one will for one moment offer to contend that an office-seeker or an office-holder can in any way bribe or corruptly influence a majority of the whole people. It is because a man seeking an office, where elections are conducted through delegates, finds it necessary to bribe or influence the votes of *only a few men*, he is thus led to enter into unpatriotic promises or personal arrangements with these *few men* in order to secure his election.

It is not claimed that good men and men considered to be ordinarily honest have not reached many high places in our Government, for the very spirit of honest self-government, so deeply intrenched in the minds of the people, is constantly calling for good men to act as representatives of the people. But there has developed about our methods of conducting elections through *delegates* so much uncertainty as to the part the people have had in the election, so many evident opportunities for corrupt bargainings between the candidates and delegates, and so much that favors corruption in a general way as well as specifically, that the people are rapidly losing faith in their office-holders so elected.

One reason is because our office-holders having been nominated or elected through delegates are thus placed so far away from the influence of the people, there is a feeling that this alone gravely lessens the proper sense of responsibility they should owe to the people.

But yet more seriously, it is from the fact that the method of electing through delegates affords so many opportunities for corrupt bargainings it degenerates every act and every service

such an office-holder thereafter performs by arousing the suspicion that his work is possibly tainted by some debt for personal services he owes to delegates who selected him as the party candidate, or to men who directly elected him to office.

It is, however, one matter to condemn the system of delegating as being vicious and intolerable as a method of conducting elections, and it is quite another question then to analyze this method of procedure, point out its specific errors and defects, and present a remedy which will at once remove or eradicate these evils *effectively*.

Delegating as a Method of Conducting Elections Has Heretofore Been Considered Necessary.

It will be plainly seen as we proceed with even a very brief analysis of the delegate and convention method of conducting elections, that it has been a slow development; a growth starting from one original supposed necessity; and that it has developed thereafter from many succeeding supposed necessities. If the error was apparently small at the beginning, it has grown grave in its opportunities for evil as this delegate and convention method has become a more fully developed system.

At the outset in our history elections were conducted at town meetings by the direct votes of all the people concerned. If a majority of the voters did not concur when a first ballot was taken, another and successive ballots were at once taken by the convened body. Some of the voters necessarily had to yield, and through this yielding to others a majority were finally led to concur.

But as towns grew larger, and constituencies were more widely scattered, or the voters became more numerous; and as offices were multiplied and many more candidates presented themselves for each of these offices, it became no longer practicable nor possible to conduct or determine elections by having all the voters concerned in the election come together.

However, if an election was allowed to be determined by a simple direct ballot, cast by the scattered voters at their local

polling places, and a choice was to be made from more than *two* candidates, the concurrence of a majority of the voters upon any one candidate would be very uncertain. Hence, to avoid submission to an election determined by a plurality, or less than a majority of those concerned, a method of voting through delegates and having these delegates meet in a convened body where successive trial ballotings could be taken, was devised. From this desire to have the *will of a majority* expressed, a *convened body* has always been deemed a necessity.

Let this supposed necessity—that we must have a *convened body where successive trial ballotings can be taken* in order to reach further concurrence, or in order to find the will of a concurring majority—be now marked down as the *original grave error* in this method of conducting elections.

It will very soon be shown that it is *not necessary* for voters to be convened in order to provide for further concurrence; and it will be further shown that this supposed necessity of a convened body, *which led at once to delegating*, in order to lessen the number of voters and thus make convening practicable, has not only been erroneous and illogical throughout, but has developed into a grave system of errors and complications which have afforded an interminable series of opportunities for corrupting our elections.

Undoubtedly, these earnest and purposely severe charges made against the method of conducting elections through delegates, which has for so long a time been quietly submitted to by the people, will arouse a doubt as to whether they can be fully sustained. Possibly, such charges may provoke a degree of resentment from those who have long been the beneficiaries of this method of conducting elections. But it will be clearly and fearlessly shown that the system of delegating and having delegates meet in a convened body as a method of reaching further concurrence, or as a means of finding the will of a concurring majority of all the voters concerned, is not only illogical and uncertain throughout, but is a deceptive and unnecessary method of procedure and affords innumerable opportunities for destroy-

ing or thwarting the will of the people at every step that is taken.

Delegating in conducting elections has been quietly acceded to by the people largely from their belief that it was a sort of necessary part of our *representative* form of government; or, that inasmuch as we must delegate the power to make and execute the laws to a limited number of office-holders, we must necessarily continue this delegating principle to entrusting to a *few men* the power to elect men to office. And then, verily indeed, has "the long habit of not thinking this method to be wrong, given it the superficial appearance of being right." The falsity and grave dangers from this supineness will hereafter be fully pointed out.

A Method of Conducting Elections Directly by the People the True and Effective Remedy for the Evils of Delegating.

The remedy for the evils which come from delegating to a few men the power to conduct or control our elections, is to be found at once in a simple form of preparing a ballot to be cast by each individual voter at his local polling place and *directly for the candidates to be selected.*

The form of ballot herein proposed simply permits *each individual voter to name upon his ballot not only his first choice among the candidates, but to also name or number such succeeding choices as he will be willing to yield to, or to support in turn, in case his first choice is not supported by a majority of all the voters concerned.*

These easily prepared individual ballots (having the form and precisely the same significance as the written instructions a voter, or many voters, would give to their delegate), when cast by all the voters concerned in the election at their local polling places, will provide returns from which there may at once be determined the candidate upon whom a majority of all these voters have first concurred.

Thus, without the necessity of delegating, these easily prepared individual ballots cast directly for the candidates will find the one upon whom *a majority of all the voters* have first concurred in a much more direct and logical manner than do the successive trial ballotings of a convened body find the will of a *majority of only the delegates* convened.

The adoption of this form of direct election will at once blot out the supposed necessity of having a convened body in order to reach further concurrence, or to reach the will of a concurring majority. Its adoption will at once blot out the supposed necessity of delegating, and with the blotting out of all this complicated, illogical and unnecessary *machinery* of electing through delegates there will be put aside and out of reach all the innumerable opportunities which this delegate and convention method has developed and which have afforded to a few men the power to conduct or to almost absolutely control the elections of men to office.

The adoption of this method of direct election will at once make the office-holder directly responsible to a majority of the whole people, to whom he will directly owe his election. But as majorities, hereafter to be made free to organize and to reorganize among the people may always be safely entrusted to govern the people, it will at once establish a government of the people, through honestly selected representatives of the whole people, and there will then be no fear that such a government will not be conducted in the interests of all the people.

Government Through Permanently Organized Political Parties Has Become a Supposed Necessity.

At the outset of every election contest which is to take place in a free government there is presented the problem of finding the candidate upon whom a majority of all the voters concerned will first concur.

When a choice is to be made from only two candidates, the problem of finding the will of a majority may be determined at once by a simple direct election.

But when more than two prominently supported candidates are to be selected from, the problem is apparently much more complex. It is in truth, this more complex problem which is practically presented to the whole people at every election.

But as a matter of fact, *the voters of to-day* find themselves divided into *two permanently organized opposing political parties*, so that the problem presented to the whole people at the outset of an election becomes divided into two apparently distinct problems, to be solved at two elections; the party *primaries*, and then the *final election* to be determined by the whole body of voters concerned in the election.

It thus happens that *each permanent party organization* takes upon itself the duty of solving the more complex problem, that of determining upon a party candidate or nominee from the many candidates presenting themselves within the party; and this each party does by the methods of the delegate and convention system.

Practically then, at the final election in which all the voters concerned may take part, the contest is limited to the two leading party nominees, and so it is that a simple direct ballot is sufficient to determine the final election, usually by a majority concurrence—although a final election may be determined by the largest concurrence or by a plurality of the final voters.

Thus we find ourselves conducting elections under a so-called "Party Method of Government," in which the real contest for office takes place within the one or the other of the two *leading permanent party organizations*, where the elections are conducted through delegates and where the nomination of the dominant party is considered to be equivalent to a final election to office.

The aphorism that "a nomination by the dominant party is equivalent to a final election to office," is to-day no less than an established fact.

The real selection of a candidate for office is made to take place within the one or the other of the two *permanently opposing party organizations*, and it is here the methods of the

delegate and convention system of selecting are submitted to; and so it is preeminently here, in these so-called party primary "elections," that this system of delegating and re-delegating, and having caucuses, and conferences and so on, affords the almost innumerable opportunities for vicious bargainings and for trading or promising patronage or rewards of every conceivable character for the support of delegates, to the end that the voices of the honest voters are completely stifled and their desires are wholly thwarted and put aside.

Notwithstanding the fact that the party nomination of the dominant party is considered to be equivalent to an election, enthusiasm in the final election must be well sustained in order to bring out the party vote. So that in a blaze of well aroused apparently "patriotic fervor" the final elections of men to office are given the semblance of being real elections by the whole people; while these elections are in truth nothing more than a ratification by direct ballot of the nominee or party candidate of one or the other of the *two* leading political parties, the real determination of this party candidate having been already made through submission of the party voters to the personal selection of a few men, or else through their vicious manipulations of the delegate and convention methods at the so-called party primary "elections."

By our submission to this method of electing men to office through *permanently organized opposing political parties, limited to two*, or our submission to what is being called a government "necessarily by party," we are practically losing sight of the fact that we originally aimed to establish a government of the people, by the *whole* people, and for the *whole* people.

The question might well be asked: If it is necessary and desirable that the selection of a *party* candidate should be made by the delegate and convention method of selecting or of harmonizing, why should not this same method of electing be resorted to by the whole people at their final elections, and thus bring the actual selecting of men for office within the purview of the whole people through this delegating method.

The answer to such a question would be very emphatic: The

whole people would never submit to a final election through delegates, it is too farcical to think of seriously. And yet such a scheme of election was written into the Constitution of the United States, wherein it directs that the President and Vice-President shall be elected by electors, who shall meet in their respective States, etc., etc., and then when it was noted that a majority of such electors would possibly seldom concur upon any one candidate, the final selection of the President was to be made by the House of Representatives from a certain number of those named by the electors; while the Vice-President was to be finally selected by the Senate in a similar manner.

To avoid the farce of "Electoral Colleges" meeting separately in each State, the necessary harmonizing is now aimed to be accomplished by great party national nominating conventions, wherein through the cumbrous and illogical system of delegating and re-delegating, with innumerable caucuses and conferences, and arbitrary unit rules, etc., etc., a party candidate for President and another for Vice-President, are sent forth for the final support of the party voters.

Astounding as the proposition may sound to those who have so long submitted to our "free government" as it is now conducted through one or the other of two *permanently organized and contending political parties*, facts will yet be presented which will clearly show that the people of any free government have no better reason for being divided into two *permanently organized opposing political parties*, than, that they become so *permanently* divided because they have thus far known of no method of conducting their final elections by a *direct ballot* with any certainty of having the concurrence of a majority decide the election, *until the choice is to be made from but two candidates*.

A final election for any office whatsoever, conducted directly by the whole people wherein each voter is allowed to name not only his first choice of candidates, but to name or number upon his ballot such successive choices as he shall see fit, will thus provide for the concurrence of a majority of the whole body of voters concerned, IRRESPECTIVE OF PARTIES, and thus at one direct

election will solve the problem at once, and for the whole people.

So great is the significance of this simple but effective method of preparing a *direct ballot* to be cast by each voter at his local polling place, thereafter to be honestly counted from, and have *the returns determine the candidate upon whom a majority of all the voters concerned have first agreed*, that it rightly becomes at once the TRUE CORNER-STONE upon which a *true representative government* may be safely erected. It is the true and only remedy for the evils of delegating and for the evils developed by our submission to so-called party government, and its adoption by the people will at once restore the government to honestly selected representatives of the whole people.

The Method of Conducting Elections Directly by the People Briefly Illustrated.

A very brief illustration of the proposed method of preparing a voter's ballot, and a tally sheet showing the method of counting from the returns from such a direct voting, will conclusively show how fully it is adapted for immediate adoption at every election in which the people are concerned.

Let us suppose an election is to take place for Mayor of a town of 100,000 voters, of whom 50,001 would be a majority.

Let us suppose that A, B, C, D, and E are prominent candidates who have presented themselves, or who have been named for this office. (It is not necessary that the number shall be so limited, since prominence of support will alone actually fix the number to be considered.) A voter's ballot, as prepared by him for such an election, might read as follows:

For Mayor.	(Another's) For Mayor.	(Another's) For Mayor.	(Another's) For Mayor.	(And yet another's) For Mayor.
A 2d.....	A 1st	A	A	A
B 1st.....	B 2d	B	B	B
C.....	C	C 1st	C 2d	C
D.....	D	D 2d	D 1st	D
E 3d.....	E	E	E	E 1st

It will be seen that each of the individually prepared ballots has the same form as if it had been prepared as written "instructions" for a delegate who was to be sent by a number of voters to represent them in a convened body of such delegates.

If used as instructions to a delegate, the first ballot shown above would indicate to this delegate that he should support Mr. B as his first choice. Then, if he found a majority had not concurred at the first or subsequent ballotings, and that Mr. B was not likely to be more fully supported, he should *drop* Mr. B and support Mr. A as his second choice. It would mean further that Mr. E might be sustained, if necessary, as his third choice, the delegate necessarily having to drop both his first and second choice. As the ballot of an individual voter, it means that this voter had expressed his full desires thereon. Such a ballot stands as his individual voice or command and fully represents his wishes in the selection of an office-holder.

The individual voter from his knowledge of each of the prominently named candidates has usually very distinct preferences. There are some to whom he is decidedly opposed, and who will not be named or numbered on his ballot. Among those he would be willing to support he has yet a first choice, and in this ballot the voter has named or numbered Mr. B as his first choice. His command by this ballot is that Mr. B is not only his first choice, but that *his voice is to be always counted for Mr. B until the contest is closed*. But this voter has also made provision for further concurrence with his fellow voters. In case a majority of all the voters have not concurred upon the count from the first choice named upon each ballot a second count must needs be made. This voter has named Mr. A as his second choice. *He now says he is willing to support either B or A*, and his voice is to be so counted in the summing up of the returns. For the purpose of reaching concurrence with his fellow voters his voice is now for *either B or A*, but it is *in full opposition to all other candidates*. If yet further concurrence is needed to reach the will of a concurring majority, this voter

has named Mr. E as another candidate, to whom he is willing to yield his support.

A simple table showing the method of counting from the returns in our proposed election of a mayor may be illustrated as follows:

Final Tally Sheet for the Election of a Mayor for ———, held ———, 1907.

Candidates.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	Whole number of voters.	Majority of voters.
Named as 1st choice	15,000	25,000	10,000	30,000	20,000	100,000	50,001
Named as 2d choice	40,000	15,000	5,000	7,500	5,000		
New concurring support	55,000	40,000	15,000	37,500	25,000		

The above record of final returns indicates that from a count made directly from the 100,000 ballots cast for the office of mayor, of whom 50,001 would be a majority, 15,000 voters have named upon their ballots Mr. A as their first choice; 25,000 have named Mr. B; 10,000 have named Mr. C; 30,000 Mr. D, and the remaining 20,000 have named Mr. E as their first choice.

These returns *so far, are exactly the same* as would have been reached had each voter been allowed to name only his first choice of the candidates upon his ballot. They indicate that a majority of the voters have not concurred. They show, however, that a strong plurality have voted for Mr. D, who would at once have to be declared elected had we decided to abide by a plurality election, or an election by the largest concurrence.

But we are seeking the *will of a concurring majority of all the voters concerned*. Again examining the returns, we find that the ballots have shown that 40,000 voters—*other men* than those who made Mr. A their *first choice*—have now made him their *second choice*, or in other words, are now willing to concur upon him. Thus these *two numbers* when *added* show that 55,000 *individual voters are now willing to concur* upon Mr. A. At the same time the returns show that 40,000 *individual voters*

are willing to *concur upon* Mr. B., 15,000 upon Mr. C., 37,500 upon Mr. D, and 25,000 upon Mr. E.

But as Mr. A has now received the *concurring support* of more than a *majority of all the voters concerned*, he must be declared elected.

Without going at more length, at this time, into a thorough comparison of the merits of this method of finding the will of a *concurring majority of all the voters concerned* in the election by a *direct count from their individual ballots*, with the methods of the convened body of delegates seeking to reach a concurrence of a *majority of their number through successive trial ballotings*, it is enough to direct attention to this one fact, to wit: That the building up of a further concurrence in the successive ballotings of a convened body is reached by *adding the votes* of those delegates who yield and name a candidate as their second choice *to those* who remain steadfast in the support of this same candidate as their first choice; and that the building up of a further concurrence of the individual voters is done by the very same *adding of those* who have named a candidate as their second choice *to those* who have before named this candidate as their first choice. So that the principle of reaching further concurrence is obtained by this *adding* in each instance, and has a similar significance in each case.

From even this brief description of the proposed method of conducting elections through *direct ballots*, it should at once be seen that it is fully adapted for conducting any election which comes before the people. Being an election by ballots, it is equally well adapted for use by a *convened body*, or by any number of voters, no matter how great their number nor how widely scattered they may be; and no matter how many candidates are to be selected from. It is well adapted for the selection of party candidates by the ballots of all the party voters concerned. The fear that an unusual number of candidates will present themselves, or that an unmanageable number will be voted for, is unfounded, since public favor will soon crystalize about the few

really eligible candidates, and all others will at once fall out of consideration.

**Our Efforts at Securing "Political Reform" Have Failed
Because they Have Heretofore Been Directed Against
the Results of an Evil Method Instead of Being
Directed Against the Cause of the Evils.**

It is proclaiming nothing new to state that for very many years it has been known that our existing methods of conducting elections were somewhere the source of constant political corruption. A corrupt trafficking in political favors of every description in return for the support of delegates at party primaries has been well known. These corrupt bargainings have been declaimed against and are being written about almost daily. The efforts of many honest and most earnest men have been directed against these well-known practices. Intelligent men have inveighed against the "party boss," against the "political machine," and even against the "apathy" of their neighbors. "Committees of 100" have followed other "committees" with like purposes. "Independent" party organizations have followed others proclaiming similarly high and earnest purposes, and the very grave question as to whether "reform" should be reached "within the party," or can only be had "from without it," has been much discussed. Yet not one of these efforts have in the least tended toward actual "political reform," save that they have served to show the great and urgent need of it. Earnest men have been attempting to reform the evil results of delegating, while they have not realized that delegating itself was the real cause or furnished the innumerable opportunities for our political corruption. *The vicious and corrupting "political machinery" has been throughout this delegate and convention method of conducting elections, awaiting to be ever and ever again* MANIPULATED BY MEN SEEKING THE OFFICES. It has been this illogical and senseless submission to delegates in conducting our elections which has furnished the unlimited opportunities for deceiving and thwarting the will of the people. It has

been these opportunities furnished by the system of delegating which have allowed a few men to practically conduct and control our elections throughout every phase of our governmental system, and which has bred and nurtured corruption in every part of the system. And so it has been because we have believed this method of conducting our elections *through delegates to be a necessity* we have not thought of condemning it specifically.

The evils which come from delegating in conducting elections have taken hold of every part of our governmental system. Political corruption, as its outcome, has invaded every election in our national, state, municipal, and local governments, and every form of personal power, plunder, or "graft" that can in any way be made use of has been made to serve as rewards for the election of men to office through the purchasing or owning of delegates.

From not knowing of a method of reaching a majority concurrence through the direct ballots of all the voters concerned, we have fallen into the treacherous grasp of government conducted through permanently organized parties; while these thoroughly organized factions, practically made up of a few desperate political leaders and their favored followers who are constantly appealing to the prejudices of party voters, and who successfully control elections by their management and manipulation of the delegate and convention method of making party nominations, have become the real governing power in the land. So great and so grave has become this rule of party—made a thousandfold more dangerous because it places the power to determine the election of men to office in the hands of a *few men* who are trained in manipulating the opportunities afforded by the system of delegating—that it now invades every conceivable matter of public or private interest, which in any way may be brought into relationship with any office-holding occupation or business.

The rule of party, or more specifically, the rule of a few men organized in the name of a political party, finds some of its

richest rewards in the control of the many public affairs, public offices, and public utilities of the many great cities. It is here the office-seeker and, later, the office-holder finds innumerable places and materials which he may offer as rewards to voters and to delegates who are to serve his purposes in securing an election to office.

But the whole system of controlling delegates and practically conducting or dominating our elections is linked throughout, and so it is, that our so-called "National Political Parties" do not limit their concern to National or State affairs, but invade and join in one great office-holding interest. They join in manipulating the machinery of the delegate and convention system, which consists in office-holding and the rewarding of delegates or others needed to control elections, by dispensing the offices to be filled by appointment and favors of every conceivable description which can be traded in by men.

The evils which come from delegating in conducting our elections, and the evils which have grown from the supposed necessity of submitting to a government by one or the other of two *permanent party organizations* as a combined method of reaching the will of a majority, are both at work rapidly undermining our hopes for a true representative government.

The Remedy for All these Evils, which will at once blot out their supposed necessity, is now offered to the whole people in the *simple form of direct ballots*, which when once placed in the hands of the people will restore the government to the *whole people*, and will make self-government, or a government through honestly selected representatives, *a new living proposition*.

I now ask the intelligent teachers and leaders of men everywhere to have the courage to examine into this problem, and after trying it out and proving its worth, teach it to all the people. Try this method of reaching the will of a majority in your lyceums, in your business or social organizations, or wherever an election is to take place, and more than two candidates are offering themselves for the same office, or wherever three or

more persons, places, dates, or things whatsoever, are to be selected from. Try it in your Sunday School organizations. Try it everywhere, in town, in city, in State, and even in National elections, and find that it will solve the problem of finding the will of a concurring majority of all concerned in a direct, logical, and truthful manner.

I again ask all intelligent men to have the courage to try it. The time is near approaching when office-seekers will have to *reckon directly with the people*. A little honest concern in, and a future respect for their interest in truthful elections may prove of value toward securing an office from the hands of the people concerned.

Again addressing the whole people: This is not an attempt to break down any factor nor destroy any part which rightfully belongs to our system of representative government. It is a *direct appeal* to your intelligence, to your patriotism, and to your love for honest self-government; that you should at once act together and blot out of use the system of delegating and of delegate conventions and adopt the method of electing men to office by the direct voice of all the voters concerned. It is an appeal to you to remove at once a vicious, malignant and truly destructive growth, which we have unconsciously allowed to develop into our system of electing men to office. Let us have the courage to destroy it and adopt a method of conducting elections directly by the people.

It too frequently occurs that a reader is led to examine or read an article because of his knowledge of the writer; or it may even happen that a person has read a paper through, and then can only estimate its worth by his information concerning the fame or notoriety of its author.

It is desired that this and succeeding papers upon this great subject of having honest elections conducted directly by the

people, shall be read and weighed wholly upon the merits they set forth, and to the extent they appeal to the intelligence of well informed people.

They are therefore simply addressed to all the people concerned, by one of their number.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May, 1907.*

All communications and requests for copies of this and succeeding papers may be addressed to "Direct Elections," P. O. Box 2503, Washington, D. C.

These papers will be sent postpaid to any part of the world:

One copy.....	\$0.10
Twelve copies.....	1.00
One hundred copies.....	7.50
One thousand copies.....	50.00

Succeeding papers will be at once published upon the following subjects:

Paper No. 2. A more complete analysis of the illogical nature, and of the evils of the delegate and convention system as a method of reaching the will of a majority, as shown by a comparison with the method by Direct Elections by all the voters concerned.

Paper No. 3. An examination into the reasons for party development, and a more thorough analysis of the evils which come from the limiting to *two permanently organized and opposing political parties*, and the conducting of a free government through permanent parties or factions of the whole people.

Paper No. 4. A complete arrangement, showing the principle of preparing ballots, the manner of arranging local, intermediary, and final tally sheets for conducting any direct election by the people. Also showing a new and comprehensive method of conducting secure and secret ballots, with a final appeal for the establishment of a National Bureau of Elections, having subordinate State election commissions and local election superintendents; constituting a national election system, and guaranteeing to every State and all the people a republican or true representative form of government.



